

1 Bingham McCutchen LLP
2 DAVID M. BALABANIAN (CA 37368)
3 CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (CA 121539)
4 JOY K. FUYUNO (CA 193890)
5 Three Embarcadero Center
6 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
7 Telephone: (415) 393-2000
8 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286

5
6 Bingham McCutchen LLP
7 RICHARD A. RIPLEY (DC 412959)
8 1120 20th Street N.W., Suite 800
9 Washington, DC 20036
10 Telephone: (202) 778-6150
11 Facsimile: (202) 778-6155

12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 Intel Corporation

14

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

16

17 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18

19 TROTTER-VOGEL REALTY, INC. dba
20 PRUDENTIAL CALIFORNIA REALTY,
21 individually, and on behalf of all those similarly
22 situated

23

Plaintiff,

24

v.

25

INTEL CORPORATION,

26

Defendant.

No. C-05-3028-MHP

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER TO EXTEND FILING DATE
FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT

27

28

IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEIR

29

COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS:

30

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Defendant Intel Corporation and Plaintiff

31

Trotter-Vogel Realty, Inc., dba Prudential California Realty hereby stipulate that Intel

32

Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the

33

above captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings

34 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE RESPONSE DATE

1 per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407 or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied.
2 The parties request this extension of time to answer or otherwise respond because the plaintiffs
3 in *Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N.D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related
4 matter, have filed a petition to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C.
5 Section 1407, and the above-styled action has been identified as a related action to that petition.
6 As a result the outcome of the pending petition will impact significantly the schedule of this
7 case.

8 This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just
9 begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.

10 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.
11 DATED: August 12, 2005

12 Bingham McCutchen LLP

13

14

15 By: _____ /s/ Joy K. Fuyuno
16 JOY K. FUYUNO
Attorneys for Defendant
Intel Corporation

17 DATED: August ___, 2005

18

19

Cotchett, Pitre, Simon & McCarthy

20

21

By: _____ NANCY L. FINEMAN
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff
23 Trotter-Vogel Realty, dba Prudential California
Realty

24

25

26


1

2 **[PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE DATE**

3 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Intel Corporation's response to
4 Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case
5 pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section
6 1407, or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied.

7 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: August 19, 2005



9
10 Honorable Marilyn H. Patel
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26